l

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/766,003	01/29/2004	Andrew J. Moss	118414	2014

25944 7590 08/10/2006

OLIFF & BERRIDGE, PLC
P.O. BOX 19928
ALEXANDRIA, VA 22320

EXAMINER	
NORTON, JENNIFER L	
ART UNIT	**PAPER NUMBER**
2121	

DATE MAILED: 08/10/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/766,003	Applicant(s) MOSS, ANDREW J.	
	Examiner Jennifer L. Norton	Art Unit 2121	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE _3_ MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on _15 May 2006_.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) _1-16_ is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) _1-16_ is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☒ The drawing(s) filed on _29 January 2004_ is/are: a)☒ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☒ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date 4/13/06

4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .

5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)

6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. The following is a **Final Office Action** in response to the Amendment received on 15 May 2006. Claims 1-16 are pending in this application.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

2. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

> A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –
>
> (b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

3. Claims 1-3, 5, 7-9, 11 and 13-16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No.: 3,856,034 (hereinafter Itoh).

4. As per claim 1, Itoh discloses a control system for supplying a control signal to a controlled apparatus the system comprising:

an error generation means (Fig. 1, element 6) operable to produce an error signal (col. 3, lines 20-27 and Fig. 1, element x sub. s – x) from a feedback value (col. 3, lines 20-24 and Fig. 1, element 5) relating to a measured operating parameter (col. 3, lines 20-24 and Fig. 1, element 4 and x) of a controlled apparatus (col. 1, lines 14-18), and a required value (col. 3, lines 24-27 and Fig. 1, element x sub. s) relating to a desired operating parameter value of the controlled apparatus (col. 1, lines 14-23 and col. 3, lines 24-27); and

a controller (Fig. 1, element 1) operable to receive the error signal (col. 3, lines 8-10 and Fig. 1, element x sub. s - x and a gain signal (col. 3, lines 8-10, col. 5, lines 33-37 and col. 6, lines 4-9), and to output a control signal in dependence upon the values thereof (col. 3, lines 8-16, col. 5, lines 1-4 and 33-37 and col. 6, lines 4-9), wherein a gain selection means (col. 3, lines 8-10, col. 5, lines 1-4 and Fig. 1, element 1; the gain selection means is incorporated in the controller, hence the controller receives the error signal from Fig. 1, element 6 and the gain signal from the controller via the controller) is provided, which gain selection means (Fig. 1, element 1) is operable to receive the error signal (col. 3, lines 8-10 and Fig. 1, element x sub. s - x) and to output a gain signal (col. 3, lines 8-10, col. 5, lines 1-4 and 33-37 and col. 6, lines 4-9) to the controller (Fig. 1, element 1; the gain selection means is incorporated in the controller, hence the controller receives the error signal from Fig. 1, element 6 and the gain signal from the controller via the controller) in dependence upon the value of the error signal (col. 3, lines 8-16, col. 5, lines 1-4 and 33-37 and col. 6, lines 4-9).

The examiner emphasizes that all anticipated components and limitations of claim 1 are present in Itoh. The controller is operable to receive the error signal (via Fig. 1, element 6) and gain signal (via the controller) to output a control signal (col. 3, lines 8-16, col. 5, lines 1-4 and 33-37 and col. 6, lines 4-9). The controller via the controller receives the gain signal in dependence upon the error signal, in which the

two signals (error and gain) are combined to represent the control signal (col. 2, lines 12-24, col. 3, lines 8-67, col. 4, lines 1-6 and col. 5, lines 1-4).

5. As per claim 2, Itoh discloses the controller (Fig. 1, element 1) is operable to output a signal equivalent to the error signal multiplied by the gain signal (col. 3-4, equations 1-7).

6. As per claim 3, Itoh discloses a system wherein the error signal (Fig. 1, element x sub. s - x) equals the difference between the required value (Fig. 1, element x sub. s) and the feedback value (col. 2, lines 12-24, col. 3, lines 24-27 and Fig. 1, element x).

7. As per claim 5, Itoh discloses a disturbance compensation means (Fig. 1, feedback control loop with cascade compensator configuration) is provided which is operable to receive an input value relating to at least one other parameter value of the controlled apparatus, and to receive the error signal, and to produce a compensated error signal in dependence upon the input value and the error signal, and to supply the compensated error signal to the filter means or the gain selection means in place of the error signal (col. 3, lines 8-27). It is inherent that feedback control systems are used to compensate for disturbances or unwanted inputs of a system (Nise, pg. 350).

8. As per claim 7, Itoh discloses a method for controlling a controlled apparatus having a measured operating parameter, the method comprising:

generating an error signal (col. 3, lines 20-27 and Fig. 1, element 6 and x sub. s - x) from a feedback value (col. 3, lines 20-24 and Fig. 1, element 5) relating to a measured operating parameter value (col. 3, lines 20-24 and Fig. 1, element 4 and x) of a controlled apparatus (col. 1, lines 14-18), and a required value (col. 3, lines 24-27 and Fig. 1, element x sub. s) relating to a desired value of the operating parameter of the controlled apparatus (col. 1, lines 18-23 and col. 3, lines 24-27); and

generating a control signal (col. 3, lines 8-16, col. 5, lines 1-4 and 33-37 and col. 6, lines 4-9) in dependence upon the error signal (col. 3, lines 8-10 and Fig. 1, element x sub. s- x) and a received gain signal (col. 3, lines 8-10, col. 5, lines 33-37 and col. 6, lines 4-9), wherein the gain signal is selected in dependence upon the error signal (col. 3, lines 8-16, col. 5, lines 1-4 and 33-37 and col. 6, lines 4-9).

The examiner emphasizes that all anticipated components and limitations of claim 7 are present in Itoh. The controller is operable to receive the error signal (via Fig. 1, element 6) and gain signal (via the controller) to output a control signal (col. 3, lines 8-16, col. 5, lines 1-4 and 33-37 and col. 6, lines 4-9). The controller via the controller receives the gain signal in dependence upon the error signal, in which the two signals (error and gain) are combined to represent the control signal (col. 2, lines 12-24, col. 3, lines 8-67, col. 4, lines 1-6 and col. 5, lines 1-4).

9. As per claim 8, Itoh discloses the control signal is equivalent to the error signal multiplied by the gain signal (col. 3-4, equations 1-7).

10. As per claim 9, Itoh discloses the error signal (Fig. 1, element x sub. s - x) equals the difference between the required value (Fig. 1, element x sub. s) and the feedback value (col. 2, lines 12-24, col. 3, lines 24-27 and Fig. 1, element x).

11. As per claim 11, Itoh discloses a compensated error signal (Fig. 1, element x sub. s – x) is produced using a disturbance compensation means (Fig. 1, feedback control loop with cascade compensator configuration) which is operable to receive an input value relating to at least one other parameter value of the controlled apparatus, and to receive the error signal, and to produce the compensated error signal in dependence upon the input value and the error signal, the compensated error signal being supplied in place of the error signal (col. 3, lines 8-27). It is inherent that feedback control systems are used to compensate for disturbances or unwanted inputs of a system (Nise, pg. 350).

12. As per claim 13, Itoh discloses a gas turbine engine controller including a control system (col. 1, lines 3-8).

13. As per claim 14, Itoh discloses a controller (Fig. 1, element 1) wherein the measured operating parameter is temperature (col. 3, lines 10-16 and col. 4, lines 61-64).

14. As per claim 15, Itoh discloses a method of controlling a gas turbine engine (col. 1, lines 3-8).

15. As per claim 16, Itoh discloses the measured operating parameter is temperature (col. 3, lines 10-16 and col. 4, lines 61-64).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

16. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

17. Claims 4 and 10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Itoh in view of U.K. Patent No.: 1,135,508 (referred to as hereinafter IBM (International Business Machines)).

18. As per claim 4, Itoh does not expressly teach a filter means is provided

which is operable to filter the error signal (Fig. 1, element x sub. s – x) and to supply a filtered error signal to the gain selection means in place of the error signal.

IBM teaches to a connection between a high pass filter (Fig. 1, element 23) and the output of a summing device (Fig. 1, element 9), and the high pass filter output to the amplifier to produce a gain (pg. 4, lines 9-12).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to modify the teaching of Itoh to include a connection between a high pass filter and the output of a summing device, and the high pass filter output to the amplifier to produce a gain to modify the abrupt nature of change in the position of a set point to allow the system to respond to the set point change more gradually (pg. 2, lines 12-20).

19. As per claim 10, Itoh does not expressly teach the error signal (Fig. 1, element x sub. s - x) is filtered and a filtered error signal is used to select the gain signal in place of the error signal.

IBM teaches to a connection between a high pass filter (Fig. 1, element 23) and the output of a summing device (Fig. 1, element 9), and the high pass filter output to the amplifier to produce a gain (pg. 4, lines 9-12).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to modify the teaching of Itoh to include a connection between a high pass filter and the output of a summing device, and the high pass filter output to the amplifier to produce a gain to modify the abrupt nature of change in the position of a set point to allow the system to respond to the set point change more gradually (pg. 2, lines 12-20).

20. Claims 6 and 12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Itoh in view of U.S. Patent No.: 4,349,868 (hereinafter Brown).

21. As per claim 6, Itoh teaches the disturbance compensation means (Fig. 1, feedback control loop with cascade compensator configuration) and a multiplier (it is inherent that Fig. 1, element 1 would include a multiplier for the computation of col. 3-4, equations 1-7) for receiving a compensation value, and for multiplying the error signal (Fig. 1, element x sub. s – x) by the compensation value to produce the compensated error signal (col. 3-4, equations 1-7). It is inherent that feedback control systems are used to compensate for disturbances or unwanted inputs of a system (Nise, pg. 350).

Itoh does not expressly teach the disturbance compensation means comprises a lookup table for receiving the input value, and a multiplier for receiving a compensation value from the lookup table, and for multiplying the error signal by the compensation value to produce the compensated error signal.

Brown discloses a look-up table that includes a wide range of values to receive an input value, and provide an actual gain control function for each input (pg. 2, lines 16-18 and col. 9, lines 59-63).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to modify the teaching of Itoh to include a look-up table that includes a wide range of values to receive an input value, and provide an actual gain control function for each input to optimize the control loop (pg. 13, lines 54-58).

22. As per claim 12, Itoh teaches the disturbance compensation means (Fig. 1, feedback control loop with cascade compensator configuration) and a multiplier (it is inherent that Fig. 1, element 1 would include a multiplier for the computation of col. 3-4, equations 1-7) for receiving a compensation value, and for multiplying the error signal (Fig. 1, element x sub. s – x) by the compensation value to produce the compensated error signal (col. 3, equations 1-6). It is inherent that feedback control

systems are used to compensate for disturbances or unwanted inputs of a system (Nise, pg. 350).

Itoh does not expressly teach the disturbance compensation means comprises a lookup table for receiving the input value, and a multiplier for receiving a compensation value from the lookup table, and for multiplying the error signal by the compensation value to produce the compensated error signal.

Brown discloses a look-up table that includes a wide range of values to receive an input value, and provide an actual gain control function for each input (pg. 2, lines 16-18 and col. 9, lines 59-63).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to modify the teaching of Itoh to include a look-up table that includes a wide range of values to receive an input value, and provide an actual gain control function for each input to optimize the control loop (pg. 13, lines 54-58).

Response to Arguments

23. Applicant's arguments, see Remarks pgs. 1-5, filed 15 May 2006 with respect to claims 1-3, 5, 7-9, 11 and 13-16 under U.S.C 102(b) have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

As per claim 1, applicant argues that the prior art fails to teach, "a controller (4) operable to receive the error signal (e) and a gain signal (k), and to output a control signal (c) in dependence upon the values thereof, wherein a gain selection means (6) is provided, which gain selection means is operable to receive the error signal (e) and to output a gain signal (k) to the controller (4) in dependence upon the value of the error signal (e)." The examiner respectfully disagrees.

The Itoh reference discloses (col. 3, lines 8-10) "In FIG. 1, a controller 1 receives an error signal, and adjusts and amplifies it to produce an amplified error signal e at its output."; (col. 5, lines 1-4) "In order to improve control accuracy, that is, to decrease the error x. sub. s -x, it may be necessary to increase the open-loop gain of the system, as is apparent from the equation (7)."; (col. 5, lines 33-37) "The valve actuating device 11 receives the output signal of the controller 1 shown in FIG. 1, i.e., an amplified error signal e to actuate the valve device 10 in accordance with the signal e to adjust the valve opening."; and (col. 6, lines 4-9) "In operation, the valve actuating device 10 receives an amplified error signal e from the controller 1 shown in FIG. 1 and moves the

valve head 10c in accordance with the amplified error signal e to set the effective area A of the opening 10b, that is, to set the degree of valve opening."

24. In response to applicant's argument that the references fail to show certain features of applicant's invention, it is noted that the features upon which applicant relies (i.e., the gain selection means is an external component which outputs a gain signal to the controller) are not recited in the rejected claim(s). Although the claims are interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from the specification are not read into the claims. See *In re Van Geuns*, 988 F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993).

As per claim 1 and similar language of claim 7, Itoh discloses the "a controller (Fig. 1, element 1) operable to receive the error signal (col. 3, lines 8-10 and Fig. 1, element x sub. s - x and a gain signal (col. 3, lines 8-10, col. 5, lines 33-37 and col. 6, lines 4-9), and to output a control signal in dependence upon the values thereof (col. 3, lines 8-16, col. 5, lines 1-4 and 33-37 and col. 6, lines 4-9), wherein a gain selection means (col. 3, lines 8-10, col. 5, lines 1-4 and Fig. 1, element 1; the gain selection means is incorporated in the controller, hence the controller receives the error signal from Fig. 1, element 6 and the gain signal from the controller via the controller) is provided, which gain selection means (Fig. 1, element 1) is operable to receive the error signal (col. 3, lines 8-10 and Fig. 1, element x sub. s - x) and to output a gain

signal (col. 3, lines 8-10, col. 5, lines 1-4 and 33-37 and col. 6, lines 4-9) to the controller (Fig. 1, element 1; the gain selection means is incorporated in the controller, hence the controller receives the error signal from Fig. 1, element 6 and the gain signal from the controller via the controller) in dependence upon the value of the error signal (col. 3, lines 8-16, col. 5, lines 1-4 and 33-37 and col. 6, lines 4-9). "

Furthermore, Itoh discloses (col. 3, lines 8-10) "In FIG. 1, a controller 1 receives an error signal, and adjusts and amplifies it to produce an amplified error signal e at its output."; (col. 5, lines 1-4) that "In order to improve control accuracy, that is, to decrease the error x. sub. s -x, it may be necessary to increase the open-loop gain of the system, as is apparent from the equation (7)."; (col. 5, lines 33-37) "The valve actuating device 11 receives the output signal of the controller 1 shown in FIG. 1, i.e., an amplified error signal e to actuate the valve device 10 in accordance with the signal e to adjust the valve opening." and; (col. 6, lines 4-9) "In operation, the valve actuating device 10 receives an amplified error signal e from the controller 1 shown in FIG. 1 and moves the valve head 10c in accordance with the amplified error signal e to set the effective area A of the opening 10b, that is, to set the degree of valve opening."

25. In response to the applicant's argument regarding "G1, G2, and G3 do not represent gain signals that can be passed to a controller"; the citation above of Itoh has been modified to clarify the record. Furthermore, Itoh discloses (col. 5, lines 1-4) that

"In order to improve control accuracy, that is, to decrease the error x. sub. s -x, it may be necessary to increase the open-loop gain of the system, as is apparent from the equation (7)."

26. In response to the applicant's argument, that the prior art fails to teach, "a gain selection means". The examiner respectfully disagrees.

Itoh discloses (col. 5, lines 1-4) that "In order to improve control accuracy, that is, to decrease the error x. sub. s -x, it may be necessary to increase the open-loop gain of the system, as is apparent from the equation (7)."

27. In response to applicant's argument that the examiner's conclusion of obviousness is based upon improper hindsight reasoning, it must be recognized that any judgment on obviousness is in a sense necessarily a reconstruction based upon hindsight reasoning. But so long as it takes into account only knowledge which was within the level of ordinary skill at the time the claimed invention was made, and does not include knowledge gleaned only from the applicant's disclosure, such a reconstruction is proper. See *In re McLaughlin*, 443 F.2d 1392, 170 USPQ 209 (CCPA 1971).

28. In response to the applicant's argument, "there is no basis to assume that controller 1 internally generates and internally receives a gain signal dependent upon the error signal (x sub. s – x)." The Examiner respectfully disagrees.

Itoh discloses (col. 3, lines 8-10) "In FIG. 1, a controller 1 receives an error signal, and adjusts and amplifies it to produce an amplified error signal e at its output." and (col. 5, lines 1-4) "In order to improve control accuracy, that is, to decrease the error x. sub. s -x, it may be necessary to increase the open-loop gain of the system, as is apparent from the equation (7)."

29. In response to the applicant's argument, that the prior art fails to teach "a disturbance compensation means (10,12) is provided which is operable to receive an input value relating to at least one other parameter value of the controlled apparatus, and to receive the error signal, and to produce a compensated error signal in dependence upon the input the value and the error signal, and to supply the compensated error signal to the filter means or the gain selection means (6) in place of the error signal." The examiner respectfully disagrees.

As per claim 5 and similar claim language of claim 11, Itoh discloses a disturbance compensation means (Fig. 1, feedback control loop with cascade compensator configuration) is provided which is operable to receive an input value

relating to at least one other parameter value of the controlled apparatus, and to receive the error signal, and to produce a compensated error signal in dependence upon the input value and the error signal, and to supply the compensated error signal to the filter means or the gain selection means in place of the error signal (col. 3, lines 8-27). It is inherent that feedback control systems are used to compensate for disturbances or unwanted inputs of a system (Nise, pg. 350).

Nise discloses (pg. 350), "Feedback control systems are used to compensate for disturbances or unwanted inputs (i.e. parameter value) that enter a system. The advantage of using feedback is that, regardless of these disturbances, the system can be designed to follow the input with small or zero error, as we know demonstrate. Fig. 7.11 shows a feedback control system with a disturbance, D(s) (i.e. secondary parameter value), injected between the controller and the plant (i.e. engine)."

30. Applicant's arguments, see Remarks pgs. 5-6, filed 15 May 2006 with respect to claims 4, 6, 10 and 12 under U.S.C 103(a) have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

31. Claims 4 and 10 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C 103(a) over Itoh in view of IBM and claims 6 and 12 under 35 U.S.C 103(a) over Itoh in view of Brown.

Conclusion

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

The following reference is cited to further show the state of the art with respect to a control system in which an error generate signal and gain value are used to control an apparatus.

* U.S. Patent No. 3,535,496 discloses a method of adaptively controlling the gain of a closed loop system indicative of the systems gain state and disturbances.

* U.K. Patent Application No. 2,229,556 A discloses a control system for a gas turbine engine.

32. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any

extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Jennifer L. Norton whose telephone number is 571-272-3694. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:00 a.m. - 4:30 p.m..

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Anthony Knight can be reached on 571-272-3687. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Anthony Knight
Supervisory Patent Examiner
Art Unit 2121

RAMESH PATEL
PRIMARY EXAMINER
8/4/06
For Anthony Knight